Remarks

Claims 1-25 are pending in the application. All claims stand rejected. By this paper, claims 1, 2, 4, 11, 19, and 22-24 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Claims 3, 20, 21 (second instance), and 25 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of all pending claims herein is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 11, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kim. As amended, claim 1 recites a system for switching between a plurality of video cameras, comprising:

> a camera controller for controlling the plurality of video cameras;
>
> a plurality of physically-separate, addressable power switches, wherein each addressable power switch is coupled to and controls power applied to a corresponding video camera, wherein each addressable power switch comprises a wireless receiver for receiving a control signal to either supply or switch off power to the corresponding video camera;
>
> an output device capable of receiving a video signal from any of the plurality of video cameras and configured to output the video signal received; and
>
> a switch controller controlled by the camera controller for addressing the plurality of addressable power switches, wherein the switch controller comprises a wireless transmitter for transmitting the control signals to the addressable power switches such that power is applied to a single selected video camera

In the Office Action, the Examiner equates the claimed addressable power switches with Kim's switch block 20. However, as shown in Kim's FIG. 1, the switch block 20 is a unitary device, similar to the prior art multiplexer 12 in applicants' FIG. 1A, and not a **plurality** of **physically-separate**, addressable power switches, as claimed.

One advantage of the claimed invention is the ability to expand the number of video cameras, almost limitlessly, by providing additional addressable power switches. Kim's

system provides no such expandability. Instead, Kim's switch block 20 is limited to a fixed number of video cameras. For this reason, among others, the applicants rejected the use of the prior art multiplexer 12 of FIG. 1A.

The claimed invention also facilitates expandability by providing wireless communication between the camera controller and the plurality of addressable power switches. Thus, new cameras may be added, for example, to a security monitoring system without costly retrofitting.

Kim, on the other hand, uses wired connections between the power supply 70, the switch block 20, and the image signal input blocks 11-1*n*. Indeed, wires are **required** because Kim uses the switch block 20 to provide power to the cameras. Consequently, even with the Examiner's Official Notice of wireless controllers, a prima facie case of obviousness is not established since modifying Kim to eliminate wires would render Kim non-functional.

Based on the foregoing, the applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended, is patentably distinct over the cited reference. Claims 2-10 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are therefore believed to be patentably distinct for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is patentably distinct. Likewise, claims 11, 19, and 24 have been amended to include limitations similar to those of claim 1 and are thus (along with dependent claims 12-18 and 20-23) believed to the patentably distinct for at least the same reasons.

As amended, claim 2 recites that at least one addressable power switch is **integrated** with a corresponding video camera. As shown in FIG. 1 of Kim, the switch block 20 is not integrated with a video camera, but exists as a distinct component.

Kim teaches away from integration by separating various components, such as an image signal input block 11-1*n*, from the rest of the video camera to save on manufacturing

costs. Kim cites in his discussion of the background art the disadvantage of using conventional CCD cameras in that they include duplicate components, such as a signal input block, signal processor, and power supply (col. 1, line 60 to col. 2, line 15). Accordingly, Kim brings as many components as he can out of the camera (*e.g.*, A/D converter 30, microcontroller 40, image processor 60, power supply 70, etc.). This is the opposite of integration. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully submit that claim 2, which recites integration, is patentably distinct.

Claims 3, 4, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim. With respect to claims 3 and 4, the Examiner takes Official Notice of wireless controls and contends that the use thereof with Kim's system would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

However, as discussed above, even if wireless connections were provided for control purposes, as the Examiner suggests, Kim would still use wired connections between the switch block 20 and the image signal input blocks 11-1*n* to provide power to the cameras. Thus, the advantages cited by the examiner (*e.g.*, greater mobility) would not be realized. Eliminating wires entirely would render Kim's system non-functional. Hence, the applicants respectfully submit that Kim teaches away from wireless connections and that claim 4 is, therefore, patentably distinct.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully submit all pending claims herein, *i.e.*, claims 1-2, 4-19, and 21-24, are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and early allowance of the same are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul G. Allen et al.

By _____
Kory D. Christensen
Registration No. 43,548

STOEL RIVES LLP
One Utah Center Suite 1100
201 S. Main Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84111-4904
Telephone: (801) 328-3131
Facsimile: (801) 578-6999
Attorney Docket No. 50588-175